

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

*Filed in open Court this 21st day
of September, 2007 dk*

POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC., a
Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware
corporation, and FAIRCHILD
SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION, a
Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 04-1371 JJF

SPECIAL VERDICT
AND INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY - VALIDITY

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '075 PATENT

1. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that claim 1 of the '075 Patent is anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

YES _____ NO X

2. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '075 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 1:	YES _____	NO <u> X </u>
Claim 5:	YES _____	NO <u> X </u>

(FORM CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE)

VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '876 PATENT

3. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 1 of the '876 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

YES _____ NO X

VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '851 PATENT

4. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '851 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 1: YES _____ NO X
 Claim 4: YES _____ NO X

VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '366 PATENT

5. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that claim 9 of the '366 Patent is anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 9: YES _____ NO X

6. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '366 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 9:	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Claim 14:	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

You must each sign this Verdict Form: Dated: SEP 21, 2007

REDACTED